



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,732	09/12/2003	In Hee Han	9988.057.00-US	4914
30827	7590	11/18/2005	EXAMINER	
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP 1900 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006			GRAVINI, STEPHEN MICHAEL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3749	

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Tenth

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/660,732	HAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephen Gravini	3749	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 October 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Torborg et al. (US 5,555,647). Torborg is considered to disclose a motor shaft **34** structure for a clothes dryer **10**, the clothes dryer including a drying drum **22** rotatably mounted in a body, a motor bracket **36** fixed to a bottom of an inside of the body, a motor **24** mounted on the motor bracket for generating a rotating power, the motor having a motor shaft and a fan **46** coupled to the motor shaft, the motor shaft comprising a chamfer **33** wherein the in the disclosed flat portion of shaft **33** is considered to anticipate the claimed chamfer because both are configured to facilitate removal of the fan from the motor shaft, as expressly disclosed in column 3 lined 53-67; or alternatively:

a motor bracket **36** fixed to a bottom of a dryer;

a motor **24** mounted on the motor bracket, the motor including a motor shaft **33** extending therefrom; and

a fan **46** coupled with the motor shaft, wherein the motor shaft includes a chamfer configured to facilitate removal of the fan from the motor shaft. Chamfer is broadly and reasonably construed from the specification to be a part of a shaft that can be clamped with a tool from specification paragraph [0032] such as a spanner being inserted into a chamfered part from specification paragraph [0033]. Chamfer is a term

well known in the prior art of drive shafts to be a portion of the shaft allowing a clamping configuration as discussed in LeFlar or Kennedy in an earlier action. Dictionary definitions are unnecessary to define the claimed terms since the specification and drawings clearly define the term chamfer with respect to the claimed invention. Torborg is also considered to disclose the claimed D-cut form as shown in figure 5 since the cut away portion of a cylindrical shaft will form a cut shape of the letter D, as claimed, and as also shown in figure 5, the chamfer is disposed between the motor and bracket as claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 4 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Torborg in view of Pool (US 6,343,529). Torborg is considered to disclose the claimed invention comprising:

a motor bracket **36** fixed to a bottom of a dryer;

a motor **24** mounted on the motor bracket, the motor including a motor shaft **33** extending therefrom; and the claimed D-cut form as shown in figure 5 since the cut away portion of a cylindrical shaft will form a cut shape of the letter D, as claimed, and as also shown in figure 5, the chamfer is disposed between the motor and bracket or fan as claimed. Torborg is considered to disclose the claimed invention, except for the claimed fan coupled with the motor shaft, wherein the motor shaft includes a chamfer for cooperating with a tool to prevent the motor shaft from rotating when the fan is removed from the motor shaft. Pool, another fan motor shaft structure, is considered to disclose fan **16** coupled with the motor shaft **12**, wherein the motor shaft includes a

chamfer 20 for cooperating with a tool 21 or 23 to prevent the motor shaft from rotating when the fan is removed from the motor shaft as expressly disclosed in column page 2, line 50 through column 4 line 55, wherein it is well known in the art that fan motor shafts are round and when chamfered or cut to form a flat edge the side profile will form a D-cut exemplified an applicants' figure 5. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Torborg with the fan coupled with the motor shaft, wherein the motor shaft includes a chamfer for cooperating with a tool to prevent the motor shaft from rotating when the fan is removed from the motor shaft, considered disclosed by Poll for the purpose of facilitating insertion of a body into a shaft or for providing a complementary cross section fitting for such intended uses including claimed statements of tool cooperation or removal facilitation.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-4 and 6-9 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,874,248 in view of either Torborg or Pool. Applicants' assignee earlier patent discloses the claimed invention, claiming each element, except for the claimed chamfer portion. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine chamfer portion, considered disclosed by either Torborg or Pool, for the purpose of facilitating insertion of a body into a shaft or for providing a complementary cross section fitting for such intended uses including claimed statements of tool cooperation or removal facilitation.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. Applicants are reminded that current Office practice permits broadest reasonable construction of claims in light of the specification and statements of intended use are not given patentable weight unless structurally different from prior art.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Gravini whose telephone number is 571 272

4875. The examiner can normally be reached on normal weekday business hours (east coast time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ehud Gartenberg can be reached on 571 272 4828. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SMG
November 15, 2005

Stephen Ghevin